



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

should have jurisdiction of disputes between the States was not essentially different from that now before us. It was at first thought that disputes involving what we would now term honor or vital interests should not be submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the report of the Committee of Detail of the Convention, which report was made on August 6th, there was an elaborate provision for the Constitution of a special representative court whenever disputes arose between two or more States over jurisdiction or territory, or whenever rival claims were made to the same land under grants from different States. Minor disputes between States were to be submitted to the Supreme Court, whose judges, however, it was then contemplated would be elected by the Senate. Thus it is clear that the thought first in the mind of the Convention was that a court which decided even minor disputes between the States should consist of judges elected by representatives of those States, and that the more serious disputes should only be decided by judges appointed by the States themselves for the particular controversy. But this idea was abandoned. On August 24th, after debate, a motion prevailed to strike out these provisions for a special court, and in the revised report of the "Committee of Style," on September 12th, we find all disputes without reservation referred to the Supreme Court, the members of which were to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It is not to be doubted that the progress of the mind of the Convention of 1787 was along the path we now tread. First, they thought disputes of an important nature between sovereignties could only be decided by a court appointed by those sovereignties. They were thinking rather of diplomatic negotiation than of judicial decision. Later, they realized this and accepted in full the principle that disputes even between sovereign States can best be decided by a strictly judicial body and that upon such a body the representatives of litigants have no place. It is not unlikely that when actually selected we would find that the judges would differ little in nationality or personnel from what they would have been if selected on some such system of representation as is advocated by those who would abandon the principle of the juridical equality of States, one judge being appointed from each power of the first class and the rest distributed among groups of smaller nations. But the appointments would have been made upon a higher and better basis than that of representation, and the principle of equality so tenaciously adhered to by the smaller nations would have been preserved.

There are safeguards which may be properly thrown about the selection of judges of the international court which will not violate the principle, will insure a court capable of dealing intelligently with all questions which may come before it and will strengthen it in public confidence. Thus it may be provided that no more than two judges shall represent any recognized system of law, or that no two shall be citizens of the same nation or other like *restrictive* provisions. But as to *positive* requirements, let there be none save that the judges shall be worthy to wear the ermine of the most august tribunal the world has ever seen and be capable of rising above national prejudices and deciding cases solely upon the eternal principles of justice.

Platform of the Seventeenth Annual Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.

The seventeenth Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration expresses its profound satisfaction in the impressive advances of the past year, so signal as to make the year the most memorable in the history of international progress in the United States.

The President of the United States in his declaration favoring the reference to arbitration of every difference not settled by regular diplomacy and in negotiating with Great Britain and France general arbitration treaties without reserve, has taken the highest and most advanced position. We call upon our people for such earnest co-operation and expression of public opinion as shall ensure the execution of these treaties in such form that they shall not fall short in any degree of the public declarations of President Taft and of the just expectations that these declarations have aroused on both sides of the Atlantic; and we urge the offer of similar treaties to all nations ready to conclude them with us.

The efforts of our Secretary of State to secure the organization of the International Court of Arbitral Justice have during the year advanced so far as to promise the complete success of that effort before the meeting of the third Hague Conference. We urge the unremitting reinforcement by our people of the endeavor for the perfecting of this supreme provision for the administration of international justice, recognizing that it is only through the complete establishment of the system of law that the system of war will come to an end.

The Congress of the United States has by unanimous vote authorized the President to create a commission to consider the pressing problem of the limitation of the burdensome armaments of the world. We record our gratitude and satisfaction at this resolution of Congress in behalf of independent American action, and trust that the early creation of this commission will place the nation in as pronounced leadership in dealing with this momentous issue as that taken by the President in behalf of unreserved arbitration. We believe that resolute initiative on our part will win the practical co-operation of other powers and promote more definite and hopeful effort in behalf of the steady decrease of the machinery for the settlement of disputes by force corresponding to the present steady development of the instrumentalities for their settlement by justice.

We call attention to the fact that the time for the creation of the international committee for preparing the program of the third Hague Conference is only two years distant, and we ask for such early and careful thought upon this critical work as shall ensure for the next Conference the most intelligent preparation, the most constructive activities and the largest results. The nations are confronted by the serious needs of international provision for the immunity of ocean commerce in time of war, for prohibiting money loans to belligerent nations by neutral peoples, and for prohibiting betimes aerial warfare. To the full consideration of these and other imperative concerns in the period preceding the meeting of the conference we earnestly urge all friends of international progress.

We welcome and endorse the proposal recently sub-

mitted to Congress for a joint agreement by the nations of North and South America that in case of war between any of them no taking of territory from one by another shall be permitted as a result. Such an agreement has been made by all the nations bordering upon the North and Baltic Seas, and we urge the speedy American following of this enlightened European example.

We earnestly commend to our people while working for the establishment of general international relations upon a just and stable basis, the strengthening of a public sentiment which shall ensure at all times the most faithful and complete discharge of our own duties to every nation.

This Conference, distinguished by the inspiring presence of so many of our fellow workers from England and Canada, holds its sessions on the eve of the coronation of King George V. On this auspicious occasion we express our grateful appreciation of the enthusiastic response of the English Government and people to the arbitration proposals of President Taft and our high hope that the reign which has now opened may be yet more memorable than that of Edward the Peacemaker in the service of international justice and fraternity. We urge such comprehensive plans for the coming celebration of the centennial of peace between Great Britain and the United States as shall make that commemoration a notable landmark in progress, not only for these two nations, but for the great family of nations.

We gratefully recognize that in the recent munificent provisions for the promotion of peace by Andrew Carnegie and Edwin Ginn, larger contributions for our cause have been made in the United States during the past year than in all the world during the whole preceding history of the movement. We hail this generosity as evidence of the new determination of strong men to cope at last with the evils of war in a manner commensurate with their gravity; and we express the hope and confidence that these larger provisions will stir such emulation and new devotion among our people and among all peoples as shall advance with vastly greater efficiency and rapidity the commanding interests to which the Mohonk Arbitration Conferences have for these seventeen years been devoted.

The True Meaning of Dollar Diplomacy.

By **Huntington Wilson**, Assistant Secretary of State.

ADDRESS AT THE THIRD NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS,
BALTIMORE, MAY 4, 1911.

Among practical modes of pursuing the ideal of world peace is what has been called "Dollar Diplomacy," in its true meaning. Of course, this term may be applied to commercial diplomacy. Today international commerce is everywhere an important department of diplomacy. In so far as our diplomacy is commercially successful, we are proud of the fact. We are not above being practical and commercial, and, from the less material point of view, commerce means contact; contact means understanding; and if one is worthy enough to be respected and liked, if understood, international commerce conduces powerfully to international sympathy. I say, if one is liked as well as respected. Here, fortunately, the idealist's interest in foreign trade as

conducive to peace coincides with the business man's interest in foreign trade for financial profit. A merchant can be so disagreeable that one prefers to pay higher prices to a pleasanter trader. Roughshod methods are a useless handicap that can only be overcome, if at all, by immense superiorities. The most rudimentary business sense should dictate tact, sympathy and considerateness in dealing with foreign customers. So, in the broader view, every American business man or traveler, every student in university or school who is inconsiderate, supercilious, or lacking in sympathetic appreciation of his foreign associate, makes himself a missionary not of good-will but of ill-will, and so radiates an influence not for peace but for war.

But I use the newly-coined phrase, "Dollar Diplomacy," in another sense. It means using the capital of the country in the foreign field in a manner calculated to enhance fixed national policies. It means the substitution of dollars for bullets. It means the creation of a prosperity which will be preferred to predatory strife. It means availing of capital's self-interest in peace. It means taking advantage of the interest in peace of those who benefit by the investment of capital. It recognizes that financial soundness is a potent factor in political stability; that prosperity means contentment, and contentment means repose.

This thought is at the basis of the policy of the United States in Central America and the zone of the Caribbean. There this policy is one of special helpfulness in a neighborhood where peace and progress are especially important to the United States, and where, moreover, they are due the aspirations and the splendid resources of the peoples of those neighboring republics.

In China the same principle has been invoked to enable the United States to take its share in the material, as it has in the moral and intellectual development of that great empire.

To the intellectual and moral development of the progressive Ottoman Empire the United States has contributed the greatest share. There, too, it is hoped that American commerce and material enterprise will also contribute.

So, also, "Dollar Diplomacy" is enabling the United States, through a loan by this country, Great Britain, France, and probably Germany, to give practical effect to its ancient special obligations to Liberia, incidentally removing the causes of friction between that struggling republic and its powerful neighbors. * * *

Governments are the trustees of the nations' international interests. They bear this heavy responsibility and consequently are beset at every turn by considerations of what is practicable, what is practical, what is now and will in future be for the true and enduring benefit of the nations they serve.

Thus, the everyday work of peace through a benevolent and candid diplomacy, as well as the definite working out of the occasional marked advances in international morality, must fall upon governments and upon departments of government expert in the facts of international relations. * * *

Great things have been accomplished along certain lines, and the criticism that peace propaganda are unpractical has not yet been justified. It may be questioned, however, whether, unless new lines of effort are adopted the state of public feeling can be so steadily further improved.